

Appl. No. 09/843,197  
Amdt. dated 12/08/04  
Reply A to Office Action dated 09/08/04

## **II. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed September 8, 2004. No fee is due for the addition of any new claims.

Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The Office Action rejected claims 1-20. The present response cancels claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9, and amends claim 1, 8, 10, 13, 16, and 18, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **1. Claim Amendments**

Although no objection was raised to Claims 1, 13, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 16 to insert the conjunction "and" prior to the final step in each of these two claims, Applicants have amended claim 13 to insert a colon following the word "wherein," and Applicants have amended claim 18 to insert a colon following the word "where," thereby making the claims more fully consistent with the specification, and promoting greater definiteness.

### **2. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

As a preliminary matter, the Office Action refers on page 2, paragraph 1 to "the IDS filed on 7/30/04." The Information Disclosure Statement was actually mailed on July 27, 2001 and received by the USPTO on July 30, 2001.

Appl. No. 09/843,197  
Amdt. dated 12/08/04  
Reply A to Office Action dated 09/08/04

Claims 1-8, 11-12, and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Stifelman, et al., "The Audio Notebook, Paper and Pen Interaction with Structured Speech," SIGCHI's 01, March 31-April 4, 2001, vol. 3, iss. 1, ACM 2001, pages 182-189 (hereafter, "Stifelman"). It is respectfully submitted that Stifelman does not anticipate the invention as claimed. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being disclosed by Stifelman in view of Davis et al., "Notepals: Lightweight Note Sharing by the Group, for the Group," ACM 1999, pages 338-345 (hereafter, "Davis"). Claims 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being disclosed by Stifelman in view of Davis and further in view of Mora et al. (U.S. Patent 6,161,113 [hereafter, "*Mora*"]). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Stifelman. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Stifelman teaches a non-networked standalone application for a single user and does not offer the option of remote access via the Internet. The current claims as amended, by contrast, disclose a networked, multi-user system permitting access by multiple users from anywhere in the world where Internet access is available. The current amendments to claim 1 specify that the future time is one of a time during the meeting and a time after the meeting. Amended claim 1 therefore allows meeting minutes to be accessed as they are being taken, in rough analogy with a stock ticker. Stifelman does not teach this limitation. The references cited in the Office Action, including Stifelman, Davis, and *Mora*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Amended claim 8 includes the limitation of transmitting the plurality of notations and their respective associations via an

Appl. No. 09/843,197  
Amdt. dated 12/08/04  
Reply A to Office Action dated 09/08/04

electronic network to at least one user. Stifelman, by contrast, teaches a non-networked standalone application for a single user and does not offer the option of remote access via the Internet. Claims 4, 8, and 10-14 each ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims and because of additional limitations of these claims.

The Office Action notes (p. 10, lines 7-8) that claim 15 is found to be anticipated by Stifelman under analysis similar to the analysis of claim 1. Since the Office Action applies reasoning to support the rejection of claims 15 that is stated to be similar to the reasons for rejecting claim 1, with no further discussion provided, Applicants respond by incorporating by reference the responses given above with regard to claim 1. Claim 15 includes the additional limitation of transmitting the plurality of notations and their respective associations via an electronic network to at least one user. Stifelman, by contrast, teaches a non-networked standalone application for a single user and does not offer the option of remote access via the Internet. Thus the cited sections of Stifelman do not disclose all the limitations of claim 15.

The references cited in the Office Action, including Stifelman, Davis, and *Mora*, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 15. Claims 16-20 each ultimately depend from independent claim 15 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims and because of additional limitations of these claims.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 8, and 10-20 are believed patentable over the cited references and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/843,197  
Amdt. dated 12/08/04  
Reply A to Office Action dated 09/08/04

### III. CONCLUSION

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims, as amended in the subject patent application, should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of the patent.


The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

12/8/04

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
J. Steven Svoboda  
Registration No. 44,366

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928  
e-mail: jss@fdml.com